

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks. Claim 32 is added. Claim 32 is supported, for example, at page 12, lines 13-14. Applicants request that the non-elected claims be maintained and reinstated if amended to track allowed subject matter of the elected claims. Claims 1-6 and 28-32 are pending, with claims 1, 28 (withdrawn), and 30 (withdrawn) being independent.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6 and 31 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,786,784 (Nikodem) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,670,581 (Degand) and U.S. Patent No. 3,982,092 (Marriot). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 is directed a window glass for a vehicle. The surface resistance of a conductive film decreases from the longer bus bar toward the shorter bus bar and the heat generated by the conductive film is more uniform than the heat generated by a conductive film with a uniform surface resistance.

Nikodem does not teach or suggest that the surface resistance of a conductive film can vary as recited in claim 1. Rather, Nikodem merely suggests that the silver thickness or coating parameters can be changed as a whole. See col. 4, lines 11-17. The variation that Nikodem proposes is solely to account for changes in the lamination conductions or powering systems, not to vary the surface resistance in a *single* conductive film.

Degand does not remedy the deficiencies of Nikodem. Degand discloses that hot spots can be formed in vehicle windshields that have a data transmission window **20**. See Figure 2 and col. 2, lines 24-30. These hot spots are formed around the data transmission window **20** and in the lower corners of the windshield. See Figure 2. To reduce these hot spots, Degand suggests the provision of an electrically conductive band **31** around the data transmission window **20**. See col. 4, lines 46-57. However, nothing in Degand suggests varying the surface resistance of a conductive film so that it decreases from the longer bus bar toward the shorter bus bar. Rather, Degand simply suggests providing an electrically conductive band in one location—around the data transmission window. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Degand does not remedy the deficiencies of Nikodem.

Marriott also does not remedy the deficiencies of Nikodem. Marriott merely suggests that heat generated in a specific region can be greater than that generated in another region. Marriott does not teach or suggest that a surface resistance of a conductive film decreases from a longer bus bar toward a shorter bus bar. Nor does it teach or suggest that heat generated by a conductive film is more uniform than heat generated by a conductive film with a uniform surface resistance. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Marriott does not remedy the deficiencies of Nikodem and Degand.

Moreover, no combination of Nikodem, Degand, and Marriott would result in the present invention. To the extent that these references can be combined, the combination would merely suggest altering the heat in the vicinity of a data transmission window, as suggested by Degand. None of these references suggest that a surface resistance of a conductive film decreases from a longer bus bar toward a shorter bus bar.

Claims 2-6 and 31 depend from claim 1. Therefore, each of those claims is believed allowable for at least the reason that it is dependent upon an allowable base claim. Moreover, each of these dependent claims recites additional features in combination with the features of its respective base claim, and is believed allowable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

For example, claim 3 is further removed from the cited references. Claim 3 requires that the film thickness changes continuously. None of the cited references teaches or suggests this feature.

Claims 1-6 and 31 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,786,784 (Nikodem) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,670,581 (Degand) and U.S. Patent No. 5,390,595 (Cutcher). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted above, neither Nikodem nor Degand teaches or discloses that a surface resistance of a conductive film decreases from a longer bus bar toward a shorter bus bar, as recited in claim 1.

Cutcher does not remedy these deficiencies. Cutcher simply states that the thickness of a printed ink pattern may be varied at one or more locations. Cutcher, however, provides no suggestion or teaching that it would be desirable to vary a surface resistance of a conductive film so that it decreases from a longer bus bar toward a shorter bus bar. Accordingly, Cutcher does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1.

Moreover, no combination of Nikodem, Degand, and Cutcher would result in the present invention. To the extent that these references can be combined, the combination would merely suggest altering the thickness of a printed ink pattern (as suggested by Cutcher) in the vicinity of a data transmission window (as suggested by Degand). None of these references suggests that a surface resistance of a conductive film decreases from a longer bus bar toward a shorter bus bar, as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-6 and 31 depend from claim 1. Therefore, each of those claims is believed allowable for at least the reason that it is dependent upon an allowable base claim. Moreover, each of these dependent claims recites additional features in combination with the features of its respective base claim, and is believed allowable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

For example, claim 3 is further removed from the cited references. Claim 3 requires that the film thickness changes continuously. None of the cited references teaches or suggests this feature.

New Claim 32


New claim 32 is also believed allowable over the cited references. Claim 32 requires that the film thickness changes stepwise. None of the cited references teaches or suggests this feature.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: October 26, 2004



Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM:DTL